

MAIL STOP RCE

Case No: PITLP101USA

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Nelson Douglas Pitlor
Serial No: 10/007,509
Filing Date: December 5, 2001
Title: REMOTELY ATTACHABLE AND SEPARABLE COUPLING
Examiner: Todd M. Epps
Art Unit: 3632

REPLY FILED WITH REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION (RCE)

(Further Supplemental RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION DATED February 9, 2005, Response to Examiner Interview Summary dated July 6, 2006, and Response to Advisory Action mailed July 20, 2006)

Mail Stop RCE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments below that have been made after discussion thereof in a personal interview with Examiner Todd M. Epps and Alfred J. Wujciak on June 22, 2006, a telephone interview with them June 26, 2006, a further telephone interview with them on July 25, 2006, and in view of the following comments.

A Petition For Extension Of Time was previously requested. A third month Extension is needed; please consider this a request for an Extension and charge the fee to applicant's attorneys' deposit account 18-0988 under the above docket number.

The remarks below provide the supplement to the Examiner Interview Summary that was mailed July 6, 2006.

Serial No.: 10/007,509

This Response also addresses the points in the "Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (37 CFR 1.121) that was mailed July 6, 2006. The undersigned apologizes for the three typographical errors in claims 19, 69 and 70, which are mentioned in such notice; those errors have been corrected.

Regarding the telephone interview July 25, 2006, the Examiners and the undersigned discussed the non-entry of the Amendment filed July 12, 2006. The reason is stated in the Advisory Action of July 20, 2006. While the Applicant does not agree with such reason, nevertheless in the interest of expediting consideration of this Amendment and advancing prosecution, this RCE is filed.

During the telephone interview July 25, 2006, the Examiners agreed that the claims of record are patentable over the art of record. The claims of record are those submitted below, which also were submitted in the non-entered Amendment filed July 12, 2006. It is noted that the Examiners agreed that the correction made to claim 85 below was appropriate and that claim 85 as amended below is included in the claims that were agreed as patentable over the art of record.